

REMARKS

By way of summary, Claims 50-69 are pending prior to entry of this amendment. By this paper, Claims 50, 52, 55-58, 63, 64, and 67 are amended, Claims 51, 53, 54, 61, 62, 66, 68, and 69 are canceled, and Claims 70-102 are new. Thus, Claims 50-102 are presently pending and presented for consideration.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects Claims 50-52, 55, 57, 59-61, 66, 68, and 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,257,767 to Carden Jr. ("Carden") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2006/0242583 to MacNaughton, et. al. ("MacNaughton") and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,260,064 to Kurzrok. The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of teachings of Carden Jr., MacNaughton, and Kurzrok fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of Claim 50 and, therefore, Claim 50 is patentable over the combination of Carden Jr., MacNaughton, and Kurzrok.

Kurzrok discloses:

[I]t is the objective of the present invention to provide a system for presenting a web site which automatically collects specific qualitative information regarding the contents of a web site, including associated advertisement. (*Kurzrok*, Col. 1, Lines 39-44)

Memory 16 includes several files, each file defining a web page of the subject site. For example, FIG. 2 shows how a typical page may look to a reader accessing the site. This particular page may describe to the reader how to install a particular piece of hardware on a PC. The page has two distinct zones. The main zone or portion of the page is the text 100 which provides actual content or information required by a reader. This text may include instruction on a computer-related issue, but of course it may include any kind of information, such as, but not restricted to: Travelogues[,] Recipes; Reviews of a book, play, magazine, musical selection, or other literary criticism, Actual literary text.

Also provided in zone 100 may be other types of information besides text, such as graphics, audio and visual information, etc. [A] second zone is also provided which consists of advertisements. In fact, zone 102 may include a number of such advertisements, which can be spread around or even embedded in zone 100, as at 102A. (*Id.*, Col. 2, Lines 42-63)

In accordance with this invention, a third type of zone 104, 106 is provided which is associated either with the main text of zone 100 or one of the advertisements of zone 102. These zones are used to invite the reader to provide rating information about the contents of the associate zone. (*Id.*, Col. 3, Lines 9-14)

In contrast, amended Claim 50 recites, in part:

A computer-implemented method for exchanging information within a group of users on a wide area network, comprising:...

serving a topic-specific user interface to a plurality of remote clients over a wide area network;

receiving information posts responsive to the defined topic;

receiving a plurality of links to respective different remote information resources, each containing information related to the defined topic...

updating the topic specific user interface to include user-interface objects associated with respective posts or links, wherein the user interface objects are configured to enable users to rate the relevance of respective ones of the information posts and the plurality of links to the defined topic;

receiving user ratings from the plurality of remote clients responsive to the user interface objects;

Kurzrok discloses "[T]ext 100 which provides actual content or information required by a reader but may of course include any kind of information" and "a second zone 102... which consists of advertisements," which are very much different than "information posts responsive to the defined topic" and "a plurality of links to respective remote information resources, each containing information related to the defined topic," as recited in Claim 50. Furthermore, "zones [104, 106 that] are used to invite the reader to provide rating information about contents of the associated zone," as described by Kurzrok, are different than ratings of, "the *relevance* of respective ones of the information posts and the plurality of links *to the defined topic*," as recited in Claim 50. Therefore, Kurzrok at least fails to teach or suggest, "updating the topic-specific user interface to include user-interface objects associated with respective posts or links, wherein the user interface objects are configured to enable users to rate the relevance of respective ones of the information posts and the plurality of links to the defined topic" and "receiving user ratings from the plurality of remote clients responsive to the user interface objects," as recited in Claim 50.

Application No.: 09/648,474
Filing Date: August 21, 2000

The Office Action additionally acknowledges that the Carden and MacNaughton references also fail to address these deficiencies. Therefore, even if one were to assume, for the sake of argument, that the Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok references were combined as suggested by the Office Action, the combination of Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok would not result in, teach or suggest, "updating the topic-specific user interface to include user-interface objects associated with respective posts or links, wherein the user interface objects are configured to enable users to rate the relevance of respective ones of the information posts and the plurality of links to the defined topic" or "receiving user ratings from the plurality of remote clients responsive to the user interface objects," as recited in Claim 50. Therefore, the Applicants submit that Claim 50 is not obvious in view of the combination of Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

New Claims 71-102

By this paper, new Claims 71-102 have been added. The Applicants submit that new Claims 71-102 are fully supported by the Specification as originally filed. The Applicants further submit that the subject matter of new independent Claims 71, 83, and 95 are not anticipated or obvious in view of the art of record.

Claim 71:

Claim 71 recites, in part:

A computing system comprising one or more computing devices configured to exchange information within a group of users on a wide area network, comprising:

a computing device operative to: ...

receive information posts responsive to the defined topic and a plurality of links to respective different remote information resources each containing information related to the defined topic;

receive user ratings indicating relevance of respective ones of the information posts to the defined topic and relevance of ones of the plurality of links to the defined topic;

aggregate the user ratings to determine aggregate relevance ratings for respective posts and links; and

update the topic-specific user interface to include the information posts and the plurality of links in a ranked order

according to the aggregate relevance ratings for respective information posts and links;

The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, alone and in any combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of Claim 71. For example, none of the Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok references individually, or in combination, teach or suggest, "A computing system comprising one or more computing devices configured to exchange information within a group of users on a wide area network, comprising: a computing device operative to: ... receive user ratings indicating relevance of respective ones of the information posts to the defined topic and relevance of ones of the plurality of links to the defined topic," as recited in Claim 71. The Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok references individually, or in combination, further fail to teach or suggest a system comprising, "a computing device operative to:... aggregate the user ratings to determine aggregate relevance ratings for respective information posts and links; and update the topic-specific user interface to include the information posts and the plurality of links in a ranked order according to the aggregate relevance ratings for respective information posts and links," as recited in Claim 71.

For example, Kurzrok discloses:

In an internet or similar distributed computer network-based information distribution system, a site host includes a totaling element for totaling ratings for articles an advertisements associated with a particular web page. ... the ratings are generated by each reader after the reader has read the article or advertisement. The ratings are totaled and used to generate a cumulative rating parameter representative of the popularity of the article. (*Kurzrok*, Abstract)

"A cumulative rating parameter representative of the popularity of the article" as disclosed by Kurzrok is different than, "user ratings indicating relevance of respective ones of the information posts and of the plurality of links to the defined topic," as recited in Claim 71. For at least this reason, Kurzrok fails to teach or suggest the system recited in Claim 71. Carden and MacNaughton further fail to remedy this deficiency of Kurzrok, as they also fail to teach or suggest, "[receiving] user ratings indicating relevance of respective ones of the information posts and of the plurality of links to the

defined topic," as recited in Claim 71. Additionally, Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok also fail to teach or suggest other features of Claim 71, such as, "A computing system comprising one or more computing devices to exchange information within a group of users on a wide area network, comprising: a computing device operative to:... update the topic-specific user interface to include the information posts and the plurality of links in a ranked order according to the aggregate relevance ratings for respective information posts and links." Thus, the Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the features of Claim 71 and, therefore, Claim 71 is patentable over Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok, individually, or in combination.

Claim 83

Claim 83 recites:

A computer implemented method for exchanging information, the method comprising:

- generating a user interface for display of a defined topic that enables user input of information posts related to the defined topic and a plurality of links to respective different remote information resources each containing information related to the defined topic; for respective information posts,

- receiving user ratings indicating relevance of the respective information posts to the defined topic from respective users;

- aggregating the user ratings for respective information posts to determine aggregate relevance ratings for respective information posts;

- wherein at least some of the information posts are listed in the user interface in a ranked order according to the aggregate relevance ratings for the information posts; and

- for respective links,

- measure activity of respective links; and,

- for each link whose measured activity exceeds a selected value, update the user interface to include the respective link in the topic-specific user interface.

For at least the reasons discussed above, where applicable, the Applicants submit that Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok, individually, or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, "A computer-implemented method, comprising:... receiving user ratings indicating relevance of the information posts to the defined topic from respective users" or "wherein at least some of the information posts are listed in the user interface

in a ranked order according to the aggregate relevance ratings for the information posts,” as recited in Claim 83. Additionally, Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok fail to teach or suggest other features of Claim 83, such as, “[measuring] an activity of links” or, “for each link whose measured activity exceeds a selected value, [updating] the user interface to include the respective link in the topic-specific user interface.” Therefore, the Applicants submit that Claim 83 is patentable over Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok, individually, or in combination.

Claim 92

Claim 92 recites:

A tangible computer-readable medium having instructions stored thereon, the instructions comprising: ...

instructions for serving a topic-specific user interface to a plurality of remote clients over a wide area network;

instructions for receiving information posts responsive to the defined topic and a plurality of links to respective different remote information resources, each containing information related to the defined topic from certain of the plurality of remote clients, wherein the plurality of links are distinct from the information posts;

instructions for updating the topic-specific user interface to include the information posts and the plurality of links;

instructions for updating the topic-specific user interface to include user-interface objects associated with respective posts or links, wherein the user interface objects are configured to enable users to rate the relevance of respective ones of the information posts and of the plurality of links to the defined topic;

instructions for receiving user ratings from the plurality of remote clients responsive to the user-interface objects;

instructions for aggregating the user ratings to determine aggregate relevance rankings;

instructions for updating the topic-specific user interface so that information posts and the plurality of links in the topic-specific user interface are displayed in a ranked order according to the aggregate relevance rankings; and

instructions for serving the updated topic-specific user interface.

For at least the reasons discussed above, where applicable, the Applicants submit that Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok, individually, or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, "A tangible computer-readable medium having instructions stored thereon, the instructions comprising:... instructions for receiving information posts

responsive to the defined topic and a plurality of links to respective different remote information resources, each containing information related to the defined topic,” and “instructions for receiving user ratings from the plurality of remote clients responsive to the user interface objects” as recited in Claim 92. Additionally, Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok fail to teach or suggest other features of Claim 92, such as, “instructions for aggregating the user ratings to determine aggregate relevance rankings,” and “instructions for updating the topic-specific user interface so that information posts and the plurality of links in the topic-specific user interface are displayed in a ranked order according to the aggregated relevance rankings,” as recited in Claim 92. Therefore, the Applicants submit that Claim 92 is patentable over Carden, MacNaughton, and Kurzrok, individually, or in combination.

Dependent Claims

Claims 52, 55-60, 63-65, 67, and 70 depend from Claim 50 and, therefore, include each of the limitations of Claim 50. Claims 72-82 depend from Claim 71 and, therefore, include each of the limitations of Claim 71. Claims 84-91 depend from Claim 83 and, therefore, includes each of the limitations of Claim 83. Claims 93-102 depend from Claim 92 and, therefore, include each of the limitations of Claim 92. Claims 52, 55-60, 63-65, 67, 70, 72-82, 84-91, and 93-102 are believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to their respective base claims, as well as their individual patentable features.

SUMMARY

Certain features of pending independent claims have been discussed above. However, the discussed features are only a limited representation of the features that are believed to be patentable over the cited art. Furthermore, because a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that “each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference,” and a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 similarly requires that the references when combined teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, the Applicants further assert that the

Application No.: 09/648,474
Filing Date: August 21, 2000

combinations of features in each claim are patentable over the cited art. *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, (Fed. Cir. 1987); *M.P.E.P.* § 2143.

The Applicants have endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims, the reasons therefore, and arguments in support of patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are made in order to improve the clarity of claim language, to correct grammatical mistakes or ambiguities, and to otherwise improve the clarity of the claims to particularly and distinctly point out the invention to those of skill in the art. Finally, the Applicants submit that the claim limitations above represent only illustrative distinctions. Hence, there may be other patentable features that distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and, particularly, that all claims be allowed. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned.

Application No.: 09/648,474
Filing Date: August 21, 2000

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: October 21, 2009

By: 

Russell M. Jeide
Registration No. 54,198
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(951) 781-9231

7990991:lw
102109